

The great Mass Convention of the Whigs of the River Country of this State, took place on Tuesday

In the history of the States and of governments as in the lives of individuals, epochs arise in which it is wise to pause—to review the past—to consider attentively the present, and to contemplate probable futurity. We are, fellow-citizens, upon the eve of such an epoch. We are about to enter upon a new and involving question which rises far above all considerations of the personal qualifications of candidates for office—questions of the greatest and nearest bearing upon past and existing interest, and likely to control the property of the country in all times to come. We are about to enter upon a question proper in such a state of things and on such an occasion, that we bring the past into our immediate presence, and consider and examine it—that we ponder anxiously on existing interest and existing duty, and that we exercise whatever power of foresight or sagacity we possess in endeavoring to discover what is or what may be yet before us. On the 8d day of March next, fifty-six years will have passed since we began our national character and existence under the present constitution. During that period, the lapse of that period we have gone through fourteen Presidential elections, and have elected eight-and-twenty successive Congresses of the United States. Of those fourteen Presidential elections twelve have been effected by the popular vote according to the provisions of the constitution, and two by the electoral college. In the thirteen elections effected by the popular vote, in pursuance of another constitutional provision of the House of Representatives, in Congress, in default of an election by the primary mode of voting as defined in the constitution. All these elections have been legal and regular. Every successive incumbent has been elected to office has been acknowledged in succession to be rightfully in possession of that office. All these elections have been conducted without violence or disorder—without the interference of force or fraud to regulate, to pervert, to control, or to exercise of the policy of the Government. Gentlemen, these are facts of the highest importance to us, and of great interest and importance to the whole world and mankind;—because they prove that a republican government may be established and maintained, in the variety of interests, connections, associations and pursuits of a large and numerous people, and that it is perfectly practicable—that it has a possible permanence—and that it may be continued to exercise its functions. For, such a government has existed as we have seen

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

said too, this objection he did not know how to get out of, but that certainly they might raise good cotton. Now, gentlemen, these sentiments continued to prevail through all the future administrations and were recognized as such. This, then, gentlemen, is its history with regard to protection—from these historical truths, recognized by our Congress—the beginning with the very first act down to the present. From all these we learn that it is the right and duty of Congress, by a right discrimination, to pass the laws which I shall pass here at once. There are a few other topics which Congress has any power over the public lands. What the Constitution of the United States, all power of laying on duties and imports is exclusively granted to Congress by the constitution; by it is established to do so. All facilities for improvement possessed by the States were surrendered to the general government. What remained, and the power devolved upon Congress, our new government met in New York, General Washington addressed letters to the port, and called the maintenance of right honors would devolve on Congress; but as Congress had no money, and no provision was made for it, he required the people to hold up their lanterns, pledging himself that he would see it returned in good time, which he did. But now it is considered a great luxury to remove a sand bar from a harbor to facilitate the commerce of the country. I am of opinion that so far as it belongs to Congress to be exercised as by the old State Mr. Webster then passed very briefly over the objection urged by his opponents against the right of Congress to pass laws for the protection of the commerce of the United States. He referred to his own conduct on this branch of his policy when in Congress, and related an anecdote of his knowledge of the rebellion in Alabama. His constituents wanted to know the reason for Mr. W.'s going to Alabama. He recollected that two of his own townsmen had been drowned in their own vessels while attempting to enter that State, and that he had been told that the cause of the absence of all affirmative principle with the opposite party. Their creed was a collection of negatives.—They deny that Congress had the right to direct or alter internal improvements—that, in fact, they possessed nothing but the power of nullification. (Laughter.) It was true, some of their brethren, it is needless for him to say that some go farther than he is prepared to go. But he, for the time, contributed to that exercise of his privilege. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called on to oppose? What are the views of the protection of the name, Wily, he says he is for a "judicious tariff." What sort of a tariff is that? (Laughter.) It he is for a "judicious tariff," he is for a "judicious tariff." "Judicious tariff" is a "horizontal tariff." (A laugh.) But he says that he is in favor of "incidental protection," and what is that? It is more correctly speaking, a "horizontal tariff." It is a "horizontal tariff," and the true principle is this—You levy money for revenue—you pay more than is necessary for revenue, but then in laying it on, you do not care for the effect. Why, then, give the power? If he said that all are not against protection, then who are they that are not opposed to it? And if there are any who are not opposed to it, why should he, as a leader just as they do who are? No—justice requires that in this respect some exceptions ought to be made. There are, undoubtedly some exceptions. I have support, and there is little doubt about their relation to this question, which is the most important of all the issues now at stake, with regard to the commerce of the United States. I prefer, Well, then, what are the views entertained on protection by the selected leader of those who are called

[illegible]